REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 34 remain in this application. No claims have been cancelled or withdrawn. Claims 35 through 42 have been added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Paragraphs 1 through 4 of the Office Action

The abstract has been objected to for the informalities noted in the Office Action.

The abstract has been amended in a manner believed to clarify any informalities in the language, particularly at the points identified in the Office Action.

Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action

The specification has been updated to reflect the application number and filing date of the incorporated application.

Paragraph 6 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 3, 18, 30 through 31 and 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Egendorf et al (US 20030177111 A1).

Claim 1 requires, in part, "*capturing a web page* from the database associated with said URL", "locating data entry windows *in said captured web page*", and "selecting *a most probable data entry window* of data entry windows for passing queries to said database". These elements of claim 1 permit the system of the invention to find and select a data entry window

from a captured web page.

In the rejection of claim 1 in the Office Action, the Egendorf published patent application (hereinafter referred to as "the Egendorf patent") was cited as anticipating the requirements of claim 1, including the requirements set forth above. More specifically, the rejection of the Office Action cites the portions of the Egendorf publication at ¶0156 and ¶0191 as anticipating the requirement of "capturing a web page from the database associated with said URL". Paragraph 156 of the Egendorf publication states:

> [0156] In another method of the present invention illustrated in FIG. 5, steps 501 and 502 are equivalent to those of steps 401 and 402 of FIG. 4. In step 503, the search request is transformed into a plurality of queries for the plurality of information sources. Each query is in accordance with the query language and query template in the descriptive packet for the corresponding information source. The plurality of queries are sent over the computer information network to the plurality of information sources in step 504 in accordance with the sending protocol in the descriptive packet for the corresponding information source. Information is received over the computer information network from the plurality of information sources in response to the queries in step 505 in accordance with the receiving protocol in the descriptive packet for the corresponding information source. Any information source from which information was received which meets the given search criteria is identified to the user in step 506.

Reviewing this portion of the Egendorf publication, there is no indication of any capturing of a web page, and this portion only suggests that some information is received by the Egendorf system from "sources", and there is no indication of the form that these responses take. The other portion of the Egendorf publication mentioned in the rejection in connection with this requirement, ¶0191; states:

> [0191] Alpha provides a Web page with a query form on it (not shown). Its Web page is located at http://www.Alpha.com, and the page is written in HTML. It uses HTTP to both receive and send information. Alpha's query form allows for searching for shoes by any of type ("type"), color ("color"), and maximum price ("price").

While this portion of the Egendorf publication appears to indicate that a query form is provided on a web site in connection with a database, nothing here states or suggest that the Egendorf system captures a web page, or needs to capture a web page. If one looks a little farther along in the Egendorf publication, it becomes clearer that the Egendorf system does not capture a web page. See, for example, the Egendorf publication at ¶0192 (emphasis added)

> [0192] When a user enters information in some of those three fields of Alpha's query form, and submits the form, the user's browser generates a URL incorporating that information in accordance with the HTML code written by Alpha, and sends the URL to Alpha's server so that Alpha's database may be searched using that information as search criteria. In this example, assume the URL generated has the following template:

Thus, it is the user's browser (implementing the Egendorf system) that generates and sends a URL. Further, see the Egendorf publication at ¶0195 (emphasis added):

> [0195] When the generated URL is accessed on Alpha's server, the server accesses Alpha's database and returns information structured in, for example, GREP. The returned information, in this example, has the following template: "SKU:.backslash.t{A-Z}*.backslash.nType:.backslash.t{- A-Z}*.backslash.nColor:.backslash.t{A-Z.backslash.}*.backslash.nPrice:.bac- kslash.t${0-9}*.backslash.n", (which, in accordance with the GREP language, will result in a single 4-column structured representation of the retrieved data).

It is submitted that there is no capture of a web page disclosed here. It is therefore submitted that these portions of the Egendorf publication would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the step of "capturing a web page from the database associated with said URL".

With respect to the requirement of "locating data entry windows in said captured web page" of claim 1, the rejection cites the Egendorf publication at ¶0075, which states (emphasis added):

> [0075] The mechanism for extracting query parameters from a user search request which can be used to make an inquiry of the searchbase

> comprises entering user search requests in a variety of ways, including predefined forms, pick-lists, browsing of the searchbase categories, word-search, and natural language. The set of mechanisms also include storage of information that relates terms (words, word stems, phrases) to searchbase categories. These linkages and programmed inference rules, which relate sets of searchbase nodes, thereby creating a concept thesaurus, are created by both a central authority and by the authors of the information sources. A variety of word-search and natural language technologies can be applied to free-form input, as described in the background section above, again provided that the searchbase and the linkage information is available.

Considering the text of the Egendorf publication, it is clear that rather than looking for data entry windows in a captured web page, this portion of the Egendorf publication is discussing the manner in which a *user search request* may be entered into the Egendorf system for conducting a search of databases that have been registered by their respective vendors. There is no mention here of anything that could be considered a web page, much less a web page that has been captured. Similarly, there is not mention of locating any data entry windows in any web page. It is there fore submitted that this portion of the Egendorf patent would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the step of "locating data entry windows in said captured web page".

With respect to the requirement of "selecting a most probable data entry window of data entry windows for passing queries to said database" in claim 1, the rejection in the Office Action cites the Egendorf publication at ¶0079, which states:

> [0079] The sending of the generated query to the information source is accomplished by the execution of the program using the sending protocol. Such protocols may be standards such as HTTP, HTTPS, and FTP. The protocol submitted may include these base protocols along with additional information such as login ID and password. Protocols also may indicate responses to requests for information such as cookies and client-side information. For example, a protocol description submitted to the searchbase may indicate HTTPS along with the digital signature to be used for authentication. (Additional inputs would be provided as required during use of the input forms of FIG. 12A if the user indicted a selection which might require such additional inputs, for example, HTTPS.) Proprietary protocols built

> into the access methods (e.g., the "Betty Beta" example of FIG. 14A) also may be used. The protocol description allows access and retrieval from information sources that personalize their responses based upon parameters in the search request from the user's system. For example, if a search request included information indicating the party for whom the search was being conducted, the information source could tailor its responses using information about the user that was known to the information source (e.g., from its own database, or from a cookie in the user's computer), so as to return results more useful to the user than otherwise would be possible.

However, there is no mention here of any selection of a "most probable" data entry window for submitting a query to a database, and instead this portion of the Egendorf publication appears to rely entirely upon sending protocol data that is submitted by a vendor through forms that the vendor must fill out. Therefore, it is also submitted that the Egendorf patent would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the step of "selecting *a most probable data entry window* of data entry windows for passing queries to said database".

In contrast to the claimed invention, the Egendorf system relies completely upon the vendors of the various databases to actively and purposefully register with the Egendorf system before the Egendorf system can submit queries to the database of the respective vendor. This information is entered by the vendor through forms such as those shown in Figures 12 through 17 of the Egendorf publication. In contrast to the present invention, the Egendorf patent is incapable of determining the manner of submitting queries to a database unless the vendor of the database has taken it upon itself to complete these forms. See, for example, the Egendorf publication at ¶0183 (emphasis added):

> [0183] In order to permit users to access its most current database of shoes, the vendor must submit to the searchbase the search methodology which the vendor uses to allow its database to be queried. In this example, that means the vendor must provide the information necessary to enter a query into its query form and to understand the response obtained from the query. The vendor submits only the methodology; the vendor does not submit the database itself.

Similarly, the Egendorf publication states at ¶0186 (which was cited in the Office Action) that (emphasis added):

> [0186] FIGS. 12A-12C illustrate an example of a form published on the Internet for obtaining the information from the provider of an information source which would be used to create the descriptive packet in the searchbase for the information source.

This is further verified by Egendorf at ¶0196, where it is stated (emphasis added):

> [0196] In order for Alpha's database to be accessible through the searchbase, Alpha must provide the searchbase with the appropriate information about its information source, which is its query form. In this example, this information includes the identification of Alpha and its query form, the categories about which Alpha desires to be queried, the language used by Alpha's query form, the template of a submission made by Alpha's query form to its database, the protocol for sending to Alpha, the protocol for receiving from Alpha, the language used by Alpha in returning its results, and the template of the returned information.

It is therefore submitted that the Egendorf publication relied upon in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claim 1. Further, claims 2, 3, and , which depend from claim 1, also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 30 requires, in part, "an action string module interfaced to said computer system and configured to *automatically determine a format associated with an entry page* for a database from said entry page, said action string module being configured to *automatically determine an appropriate data entry window* on said entry page for use in passing a query to said database" (emphasis added).

It is submitted that, for the reasons forward above with respect to claim 1, claim 30 also defines over the Egendorf publication.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 1 through 3, 18, 30 through 31 and 33 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 7 of the Office Action

Claim 34 has been allowed.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.

By _____ Date: May 16, 2005

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.
3500 South First Avenue Circle, Suite 250
Sioux Falls, SD 57105-5807
(605)339-2028 FAX (605)336-1931